



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

northparkplanning.org

URBAN DESIGN-PROJECT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES: Monday, August 3, 2015 – 6:00 p.m.

North Park Recreation Center / Adult Center, 2719 Howard Avenue

I. Parliamentary Items (6:00 pm)

A. Call to Order* 6:01pm

Community members: Rob Steppke, Michael Limburg

Board Members: Brandon Hilpert, Peter Hill, Vicki Granowitz, Lucky Morrison, Daniel Gebreselassie, Steve Codraro, Robert Barry

B. Modifications & Adoption of the Agenda: none. Don't need to approve per Vicki.

C. Approval of Previous Minutes: July 6, 2015 (no meeting in June) (Granowitz/Gebreselassie 8-0-1, Barry abstain)

D. Announcements

Vicki has a meeting on 8/20 scheduled with the City to hammer out the recreation element.

II. Non Agenda Public Comment (2 minutes each).

Don Leichtling – wants someone to photoshop the maximum density renderings of all the streets so non-technical people can see what things look like based on current zone and density requirements.

GRANOWITZ LEAVES 6:05; BLACKSON ARRIVES 6:05; CALLEN ARRIVES 6:10

III. Action/Information – 6:15

A. Ministerial Building Scale & Transition Issues - Information

Discussion of recent resident concerns about the scale, transition to neighboring buildings, setbacks, etc. of buildings built under City ministerial approval without community input.

Public Comment:

Ross Lopez – People complain about the Huffman buildings, but new examples make Huffmans look small. Concerned that some of the properties are zero lot line. Believes people should see what the plans look like when built out. Concerned about the building in the middle of residential neighborhoods.

Maura Donneley – Would like to have projects be required to put up posts with string to see how high buildings will be before it's approved like in Solana Beach.

Don Leichtling – Because the NPPC is powerful, he wants to hear the board commit to protecting the quality of life in North Park. Wants to keep the ambiance of NP. Homes that are saved and moved, he wants to know where they get sent to, that they should stay in NP.

Would like to see that neighboring properties are not more than 1 story higher than adjacent properties. Competing bungalow neighborhoods have higher property values. Would like to have the NPPC force the city to get their act together. Stated need for immediate moratorium on building until new community plan effective.

Paul Spears – Complaints in this room won't change anything, it's a city zoning issue. So unless NP gets together to go after politicians and gets the zoning changed, nothing will change.

Board Comments:

Steve Codraro – just wanted to say that quality of life isn't in the code; but that the reality is that we can't deny property rights on behalf of other property rights. This would take a long term change in zoning plans.

Daniel Gebreselassie – agrees and supports the concept of the 1 story above neighboring properties concept. Would like to be able to look at each individual project on its merits

Michael Limburg– Value in limiting high density impacts. The proposed changes are very expensive and not really supported by property rights. But sees value in protecting transitional areas.

Lucky Morrison – I'm not satisfied with saying the current zoning is what we have and therefore that's what we have to deal with. People will build out to code, so the higher the code is what will be built up to. With the new CD3 councilmembers, would like to look at them to see which will look at who would support changing the code. Doesn't buy the SANDAG numbers that indicates that NP needs 50k people. Affordable housing, we have the highest percentage and it's not being pushed on other communities (liberty station etc.)

Rob Steppke – Bundle of rights for the property, as an owner you have an expectation of highest and best use. Issues with transit oriented development; also depends on the neighborhoods (SFR mixed with apartments, that lot is ripe for redevelopment). It's frustrating to be told we have power that we don't have, we live here too and want it to be better – that's why we are here. Doesn't think the moratorium is realistic.

Robert Barry – Rob pretty much said everything that he would say. Can't stress enough the disappointment with DSD. They keep saying that the new land use plan is making changes, but we have yet to see it implemented. Anything that is listed as multi-family is up for grabs. To a certain extent, multi-family is the future – so it's about looking at options to make it work with design input (keep the craftsman in the front, extra in the back).

Howard Blackson – Old rule was to not build higher than the California Tower. The discretionary process is topsy-turvy – state law gives certain parameters. What we are seeing is what is allowed to be built. We aren't afraid of density, we're afraid of mixed architectural patterns that don't make sense. It's in the zoning update to the CPU. We need to review the zones being proposed for zoning changes as part of the CPU. We're reviewing a plan with the implementation that is incomplete. Because NP is hot and popular, we need to address transitions.

Peter Hill – Looked at the '86 plan to refresh, the urban design section used "transition" endlessly about moving from one type to the next with appropriate transitions. That became the mid-cities PDO which is what the city reviews to check plans against. But appropriate scale didn't get through and has been lost. Now we're at the mercy of permitting folks. Feel stuck and taken by the City by how it's going on.

B. East/West streets: Lower Zoning on End Caps - Information 6:40

Discussion of proposal for Polk and Lincoln Avenues to have lower-scale zoning, mirrored on both sides of streets, on the shallow "end cap" lots of long intersecting blocks. Madison, Monroe, and Meade Avenues have this.

Less dense, east west streets – wide streets with SFR cottages on each side. Historically, they were left over lots from the square blocks. Currently used in Univ Heights district & we'd like to take that concept and move it to NP (Polk & Lincoln).

Mixed public & board comments:

George Franck – almost all non-commercial east/west streets have these end-cap lots, some as small as 2k sq ft. You see older small bungalows and a few duplexes, valuable from a

historical point of view. Suggestions that they be downsized to 20 du/acre, then allow small lot ordinance subdivision be applied. Would like to see a CIPOZ implemented to restrict these lots and only allow SFR on these lots.

Leichtling – would be a good use for the conservation areas, if we keep them as they are, they will be much more valuable and will be in high demand. If we allow them to be scraped and relocated, and replaced with 2-3 story buildings, NP will be destroyed. Concerned that until the new plan is taken care of these will be destroyed by the time the next plan is approved.

Granowitz – gets complaints about things not being affordable, but then people also wanting to keep everything the way it is. Can't have both at the same time. There's a tension that can't be ignored – do we want NP to remain affordable or historic?

Spears – I don't think we or the city can control affordability.

Blackson – Thinks we can have both expensive and affordable in the same neighborhood. Some end-caps need to be lower in some places, higher in others – can't do that with just discussing density. Lift up from a “density” discussion to an “urban design” concept.

Barry – Residential med-high to high are the ones that have density bonuses. Residential medium does not have the density bonus available. The end-cap size enables a density restriction. We need to figure out where we don't want density – because we are going to have some density added, but need to protect SFR areas.

Steppke – 3-4 years ago, worked with staff on the Polk-Lincoln issue. North side of Lincoln has slightly lower density level than south. End caps were mirrored.

Morrison – density...not everyone can afford to live in NP, doesn't feel it makes sense to dictate zoning just based on affordable housing. Often feel developers get breaks on parking etc. just because they have some affordable units which doesn't always help the community.

Hilpert – land use rights, as long as it is legal, we shouldn't dictate just because we don't like it.

Codraro – Question regarding of something that has already happened with end-caps or something concerned for possible future uses.

Gebreselassie – would like to see what it is changing from to what it is proposed to be.

Hill – Conversation moved more toward historic and affordability; in the core we're allowing some quite large 3-4 story buildings. Will small lot ordinance allow for smaller lots to be redeveloped (PDO doesn't allow for that based on the zoning, must be specific multi-family zones)

C. 2015 Public Review Draft – North Park Community Plan - Information 7:05

Discussion and input on Land Use and Urban Design elements.

<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/greaternorthpark/index.shtml>

Board & Public Comments:

Blackson – We are taking a one-size fits all, instead of looking at specific urban districts. There's a problem with the one-size zoning – the 805 end of El Cajon Blvd. is different from Park Blvd side and they shouldn't be treated the same. Feels there are lots of errors in the draft plan (e.g. 30th st being a 6 lane artery) and we feel it's a rush job. The transition issues are our issue (not the vertical plans for Uptown), our issues are on the streets, and how they sit with long alleys – transitions aren't being addressed. They're going to take away our (ability to design through) PDO designing; losing the urban design districts is a loss for overall impacts. We don't know what CC 3-7 and 8 zoning are, have no idea what it is; yet it is in our plan and it doesn't exist. CN-1 and CN-4 don't exist. They're asking us to figure out if things are in the

plan and work for us, but components can't be vetted. The plan isn't giving us the predictability that we need to know what is going to be next door.

Barry – What from '86 do we want to incorporate into this, and figure out what is missing. We lost the districts. Want to use zoning to control density bonuses (by going with lower density zones, which are not eligible for the bonus). Would like to retain the districts that they had in '86 plan.

Leichtling – would like to have Howard and/or Robert go meet with someone high at the city and compare the 86 plan with what we have now.

Gebreselassie – concerned on what is left out, City response to our comments was to just remove it. Agrees that not all streets are exactly the same the whole length of the street. Institutional use properties (schools, fire etc) wanted them to revert back to adjacent land use in the neighborhood zone – feels that would be bad because we have a lack of those opportunities. Report dates itself by referring to things that are already dated (theater for example).

Morrison – city planners have created a plan that is so nebulous that it will allow DSD to do whatever they want. They've come up with a plan to try to extract as much tax revenue as possible regardless of what the NPer's want.

Spears – mistakes with plan – Dwight to Landis / Alabama to 28th should have the lower density (rs-1) is mismarked. Urban design character areas (4-1) ; also marked Wightman to Landis ; NP Way-Landis, consistent characters vs diverse. Land use plan goes against their own zoning. Transition areas 4-3, Landis-Dwight/Alabama to 28th. (NP Historical is going to send these in to the city) Implementation 12-3 map the same area should be single family CPIOZ – mistakes are consistent.

Donneley - What impact does the NPPC have with the city? Concerned that with the work we've put in on the project, hopes that the City is listening to NP.

Codraro – For a document that will last 30 years, it seems like we are responsible for proofreading the document. Need to have a list of documents with mislabels, proofreading and other mistakes to call attention to.

IV. Information: None

V. Unfinished, New Business & Future Agenda Items: None

VI. Adjournment Hill/Blackson 7:47pm

Next Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee meeting date: Tuesday, September 8, 2015

(TENTATIVE – CHANGED DUE TO LABOR DAY HOLIDAY)

For information about the Urban Design-Project Review Subcommittee please visit northparkplanning.org or contact the Chair, Peter Hill, at urbandesign@northparkplanning.org or (619) 846-2689.

** Subcommittee Membership & Quorum: When all 15 elected NPPC Board Member seats are filled, the maximum total of seated (voting) UD-PR Subcommittee members is 13 (up to 7 elected NPPC Board Members and up to 6 seated North Park community members). To constitute a quorum, a majority of the seated UD-PR Subcommittee members must be elected NPPC Board Members.*

*** Community Voting Members: North Park residents and business owners may gain UD-PR Subcommittee voting rights by becoming a General Member of the NPPC and by attending three UD-PR Subcommittee meetings. Please sign-in on the meeting attendance list and notify the Chair or Vice-Chair if you are attending to gain Subcommittee voting rights.*

North Park Planning Committee meetings are held on the second floor of the North Park Christian Fellowship (2901 North Park Way, 2nd Floor), on the third Tuesday of each month, at 6:30 pm. The next scheduled NPPC meeting is on September 15, 2015.

For additional information about the North Park Planning Committee, please like our Facebook page and follow our Twitter feed:



[NorthParkPlanning](https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning)



[@NPPlanning](https://twitter.com/NPPlanning)